

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This reply is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated May 31, 2007.

Claims 6-15, 17-46, 48-148, and 151-153 are pending.

Claims 6-15, 17-46, 48-148, and 151-153 are rejected.

Claims 6 and 7 are amended. .

Support for the claim amendments can be found page 51, lines 14-15.

Double Patenting Rejections

Regarding the double patenting rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that, due to the still-changeable nature of the claims, these rejections should be held in abeyance, e.g., until such point as the pending claims are allowable but for such double patenting rejections. At that juncture, Applicants will, if necessary, submit the appropriate terminal disclaimer(s) to obviate any then-pending double patenting rejections. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are not ripe for resolution until there are otherwise allowable claims in the instant case and allowed or issued claims in the cases to which terminal disclaimers are sought. Indeed, Applicants respectfully note that the M.P.E.P. instructs the Examiner to withdraw a provisional double patenting rejection in the earlier filed of two pending applications and to allow that earlier filed application to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer. *See* M.P.E.P 804(I)(B)(1).

Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 6-15, 17-46, 48-148, and 151-153 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being anticipated by or obvious over US 5,079,287 (Takesh).

Claims 6 and 7 have been amended to exclude low molecular weight polyethylene copolymers such as Lucant HC-10. However, a number of the claims contain limitations that are not present in Takesh. The Office has failed to show how many of the specific limitations present in the claims are rendered obvious over Takesh. A number of the

claims (8, 9, 41-46, 48-124, 126-132, 138-148, and 152) are limited to either propylene or butene polymers, which are both absent from or taught by Takesh.

Further, Claims 10, 11, and 15 have specific limitations that are not present in plasticizers described in Takesh (Lucant HC-10). For example, Claim 10 is limited to mineral oils; Claim 11 requires a mixture of branched and normal paraffins having from 6 to 50 carbon atoms and a ratio of branch paraffin to n-paraffin ratio ranging from 0.5:1 to 9:1; and Claim 15 requires having less than 10 % sidechains having 4 or more carbons, and having at least 1 or 2 carbon branches present at 15 weight % or more, and where the NFP comprises less than 2 weight % cyclic paraffins.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that the foregoing amendments and remarks fully comply with the Office Action and that the claims herein should now be allowable to Applicants. Reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Applicant invites the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney if there are any issues outstanding which have not been presented to the Examiner's satisfaction.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account number 05-1712. Moreover, if the deposit account contains insufficient funds, the Commissioner is hereby invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to arrange payment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2007

/Michael S. Kerns/
Michael S. Kerns
Attorney for Applicants
Registration Number 51,233

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):
ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Telephone No. (281) 834-1441
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495